

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN LUNDY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one of our finest and brightest and best-liked members of staff, from the State of Mississippi, is leaving the Senate and going back to Mississippi at the end of this month to join one of the leading law firms in our State. I am talking about John Lundy, who is chief of staff for my distinguished State colleague, Senator LOTT.

John Lundy came to Washington in 1987 to work as a legislative assistant on the House side of the Capitol. He distinguished himself right away with his hard work, his ability to get along with staff members and Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, as well as work effectively with Senate staffers from our State and Members of the Senate.

He had a lot to do with the writing of the 1990 farm bill as a member of the staff of LARRY COMBEST, Congressman from Texas, who is a Member of the Agriculture Committee in the House.

John is originally from Leland, MS. He graduated from Mississippi State University in 1983 with a degree in agricultural economics. After graduation, he went to work as a research assistant at the Mississippi State University Delta Branch Agricultural Experiment Station in Stoneville, MS, near his hometown of Leland. He then worked for a while as a loan officer with a farm credit institution in the Mississippi Delta.

When he joined Senator LOTT's office, he became someone with whom I had an opportunity to work closely over the years. When Senator LOTT was elected majority leader, he made John Lundy his chief of staff. John has been one of my favorites and a good friend to me and to all of the Members of our delegation. We are going to miss him and his lovely wife, Hayley, very much, and their daughter, Eliza. They are moving to Jackson, as I indicated, toward the end of this month.

But I wanted to take this opportunity to let other Senators know about his decision to go back to Mississippi and to congratulate him on his distinguished service here in the U.S. Senate as a member of our staff and the House of Representatives staff as well, and to wish him all of the best in his new undertaking. I am confident that he will be a tremendous success in his new association with the law firm in Jackson.

We wish him well. We will miss him.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in one of the newspapers I was reading this morning, there was an editorial speaking about the U.S. position in saying that they will work to lead an effort toward the demining of antipersonnel landmines around the world, an effort that is already well underway in a number of countries, which is supported partly by the United States in the millions of dollars in humanitarian demining efforts.

I agree with the President. I agree with the administration's efforts to seek more money for demining.

We have so many millions of landmines in the ground in 60 to 70 countries that nobody even knows how many landmines are out there. Very often the way we find out where they are is when a child or some other non-combatant steps on a landmine, touches a landmine, and is either crippled, maimed, or killed from the explosion.

We also know, whether these are \$3, \$4, or \$5 antipersonnel landmines stuck in the ground, they can cost a considerable amount of money to take them back out depending on where they are—anywhere from an average of \$100 on up to as much as \$1,000 per landmine.

I agree that the United States, as the most powerful and wealthiest Nation on the Earth, should do everything possible to try to take landmines out of the ground. But I note the obvious, Mr. President. It is like trying to bail out the ocean, if you continue to put new landmines down.

Next month, in Ottawa, over 100 nations will come together to sign a treaty banning the placement and use of antipersonnel landmines. One of the most notable exceptions to the signers will be the United States of America. I think that is a bad mistake. I think if the United States wishes to have leadership and credibility on this issue they should do both—help in the demining, but do the right thing, and that is help stop further mining.

Until the use of antipersonnel landmines is treated the same way we treat the use of chemical weapons then we will continue to see them and we will continue to see the use of antipersonnel landmines against innocent civilians. They have become more and more—if not exclusively, at least primarily—a weapon against civilians. Worse than that, they are weapons that stay long after the war is over. Peace agreements are signed, tanks pull away, guns are unloaded, armies march away, and 5 years later a child on the way to school is destroyed and nobody even remembers who was fighting, nobody knows who put the weapon there.

I just mention, Mr. President, while I support our continued efforts to demine and while I take pride in writing much of the legislation to get the money for the United States to be in-

volved in humanitarian demining up to this point, I note it falls short of the ultimate goal until we have a real ban on the use of antipersonnel landmines. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. I appreciate the courtesies of my colleague and good friend from Vermont.

COMMERCIAL SPACE ACT OF 1997

Mr. GRAHAM. I rise today to speak in support of legislation which Senator MACK and I filed last night, legislation that will bolster one of the most important components of our Nation's high-technology economic future, the space industry.

For more than 40 years, my home State of Florida has been pleased, proud, and gratified to have been the launching pad for our Nation's exciting adventure in space. Our friend and colleague, Senator JOHN GLENN's historic *Friendship 7* mission was launched from Cape Canaveral. So were Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins on their way to the first manned Moon landing.

For the last 16 years, the world has watched intently as dozens of space shuttle missions have started at the Kennedy Space Center.

But as we prepare for the increasingly high-technology, dynamic world of the 21st century, space will be more than just a place of exploration. In the 4 decades since the Soviet Union launched sputnik in October 1957, space has become a site for tremendous scientific innovation. Ball-point pens, velcro, and numerous other consumer products that make our lives easier are a direct result of the space program.

Medical research has also reaped tremendous benefits from our time in space. And satellite technology has led to revolutionary advances in the way we forecast weather, protect the environment, and communicate with each other.

Space may also revolutionize the way we transport goods and services and pursue other economic and business opportunities. In recognition of these advances, Senator CONNIE MACK and I are introducing the Commercial Space Act of 1997.

Cape Canaveral is also home to the Florida Spaceport Authority, which is set to launch its first commercial payload from Launch Complex 46 in January 1998. This will be a milestone event in our State's history, and the bill that I am introducing today aims to modernize the laws that govern the United States' emerging commercial space industry.

It is urgent that we develop a clear Federal policy for this important enterprise. For much of the last 40 years, our Nation's experiment in space has been in the exclusive domain of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA].

The legislation I am offering today recognizes that space is now a public

and private sector place and enterprise. It aims to create a stable business environment for an industry that employs thousands of Americans and generates billions of dollars in economic activity each year.

Our bill pursues this goal in several important ways.

First, it will reduce the bureaucracy and redtape that plagues our regulation of the commercial space industry. Currently, the oversight of space-related businesses is scattered among multiple federal agencies, and burdens businesses with complex, confusing, and often conflicting rules. It is not an environment that encourages progress and innovation.

This bill takes the first step toward clarity by requiring each relevant federal agency to clearly state its requirements for commercial space licensing. That requirement will help space businesses in their efforts to raise capital, develop a consistent business plan, and create new job opportunities within the commercial space industry.

Second, our bill encourages federal agencies to act in a more efficient manner by increasing the private sector's involvement in servicing and launching space hardware, in addition to their current role in building rockets and satellites. This will bolster the expansion of the commercial space industry, while at the same time reducing Government costs and saving tax dollars.

For example, this legislation would call for NASA to look at the role the private sector may play in operating, maintaining, and supplying the international space station. It would also encourage the conversion of old ballistic missiles into launch vehicles, a use that will reduce storage costs and provide for less expensive commercial space launches.

Finally, it is imperative that we update existing Federal law to reflect the rapid pace of technological change. Mr. President, we cannot hope to prepare for the high-tech 21st century if the Federal Government maintains a 20th century mentality. Our laws should be flexible enough to adapt to a world in which new science and technology is created every minute.

These goals will be difficult to achieve, however, if we do not recognize the role of State and local governments in reducing space costs. This is especially relevant to Florida. I am hopeful that our legislation will spur a robust and energized commercial space industry. Within 8 years, the number of launches in Florida are expected to double. But this potential growth can only be achieved if there exists a productive working relationship among all entities involved in the commercial space industry, including state and local governments.

Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to tell you exactly what this legislation will accomplish:

This bill will require NASA to submit a report that identifies and examines

the prospects for commercial development, augmentation, or servicing of the international space station by the private sector. Private sector involvement in the commercial space industry is likely to reduce the costs of operating, maintaining and supplying the space station and will allow State governments to act as potential brokers in reducing space station costs.

We amend the Commercial Space Launch Act and to give the Federal Government the authority to license commercial space reentry activities. This is an essential portion of the bill. Without this legal authorization, commercial reusable launch vehicles will not be allowed to re-enter the atmosphere, a restriction that would stymie the realization of important technological developments and investments by the commercial space industry.

This bill reaffirms our Nation's plans to make the Global Positioning System [GPS] a world standard. GPS is a space-based system that individuals can use to determine their precise position on Earth. Although it began as a military/defense system, the GPS applications have expanded to other sectors. In addition, foreign governments are interested in entering this lucrative global market. Therefore, in an effort to protect our economic interests and our national security, it is imperative that we encourage our President to enter into regional agreements with foreign governments to secure U.S. GPS as the unquestioned global standard.

The legislation further requires the Federal Government to purchase both space hardware and transportation services from the private sector. This will encourage innovation within the commercial space industry, while simultaneously promoting greater cost efficiency and protecting our national security.

This legislation allows the conversion of excess ICBM's into space transportation vehicles. These missiles cannot be used for defense purposes due to the START treaty. The conversion of these missiles could save taxpayer dollars by eliminating storage costs and providing cost effective launches for small scientific and educational payloads.

Mr. President, I was extremely pleased when the House passed its version of this legislation earlier this week. It is my understanding that this legislation will be a priority for the Senate Commerce Committee when Congress returns from recess in 1998.

I look forward to working with Chairman MCCAIN, subcommittee Chairman FRIST, my colleague, Senator MACK, and other members of the committee and the Clinton administration, to enact this important commercial space legislation.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business continue until 2:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET SURPLUS AND PAYROLL TAX BURDEN

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue which has far-reaching concerns for our Nation. Many of our colleagues have heard of the improving economy and have participated in the improving economy and recognize as a result of this improving economy it is likely that the Federal Government will incur a budget surplus in the very near future. This comes about because of a lot of hard work by this Congress, especially this Republican Congress, in controlling the rate of growth of the Federal Government. It is something that is unusual, obviously, not having occurred in the last 25 years.

Not only will we have a budget surplus, but it is projected by OMB that the budget surplus will continue well into the first decade of the next century.

So, I think that we need to discuss how we address this issue. This is an unfamiliar situation, as I mentioned, for Washington. We certainly do not have much experience in dealing with surpluses so there is naturally some perplexity as to how best to address it. To my mind the answer is pretty clear: The surplus should result in relief to the American taxpayers.

Needless to say this is the right answer on economic grounds. If the Government takes in more revenue than it needs to finance its operation, the answer is not for the Government to spend that; rather, it only makes economic sense to return the extra revenues to the private economy that bears the burden of supporting the Government. Not only that, but in this particular case, the appropriateness of tax relief could not be more clear. Let none of us forget what has enabled Congress to accomplish this goal of balancing the budget. It has in large part been the dramatic growth of the economy.

If the private sector in this country had not come through with a surge of productivity, then the budget negotiators might not have been able to reach the agreements necessary to accomplish a surplus to reach a balanced budget. It would, therefore, be ungracious of us, at the least, not to return that surplus to the taxpayers who have earned it.

I rise, Mr. President, today to voice a specific hope—that this Congress will consider, when that time comes, when we have reached a surplus, including a cut in the payroll tax as the appropriate way to address the returning of this surplus to the American taxpayer.

There are several reasons for this—all of them, I believe, noble. First of